International Journal of Multidimensional Studies
Volume 1, Issue 1
ISSN: 3067-7092
DOI:10.64561/ijmsv1i1-001-250806114612

Efficacy of Sacituzumab Govitecan in Metastatic Breast Cancer

[1]*Orcun Can, [2] Osman Gökhan Demir
[1]Acibadem Mehmet Ali Aydinlar University, AcibademMaslak Hospital, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Medical Oncology, Istanbul, Turkey

Abstract

Background: MBC is still one of the toughest cancers to treat and chemotherapy usually does not offer a long-lasting cure. There has been good activity reported with Sacituzumab Govitecan (SG), a drug that works against TROP-2, in both clinical trials and real life. At first, it was given clearance for treating metastatic TNBC, but is now allowing for treatment of HR+ HER2-negative subtypes as well.

Methods: All 48 female patients with metastatic breast cancer treated with SG during the study period were included (December 2022-March 2025). Clinical data consisted of receptor subtype, menopausal status, the presence of CNS disease, treatments given, responses to treatment, AEs and survival outcomes. PFS was reported for all patients and overall survival was reported for those who had died. All toxicities were evaluated with CTCAE v5.0.

Results: 16 patients (68.8%) had TNBC, whereas 14 patients (31.2%) had HR+ disease. Patients were a median age of 51 and the sample consisted of treatments using SG as the third option or beyond. CNS metastases were found in about 1 in every 3 patients. Patients received a median overall response of 3.9 months. In patients, neutropenia, rash and pneumonitis were the most frequent AEs seen at grades 3 and 4. Immunotherapy dosage was adjusted down in almost 30% of cases, with 13% having to stop treatment because of side effects. A total of 27.1% of patients had previously been given PARP inhibitors and 43.7% had received immunotherapy.

Conclusion: All together, the analysis of both types of data indicates that patients with metastatic breast cancer can benefit from Sacituzumab Govitecan, especially when used later in treatment. It is safe to use, having the same or fewer side effects, while still improving both PFS and OS in patients. The results suggest that SG can contribute to updating MBC treatment strategies and point out the need for more research on finding the best ways to treat people with MBC in the brain.

Keywords: Sacituzumab Govitecan, Metastatic Breast Cancer, Antibody-Drug Conjugates, Treatment Efficacy, Chemotherapy, Progression-Free Survival, Overall Survival, Trop-2 Targeting, Targeted Therapy, Clinical Outcomes

1. Introduction

Despite decades of research and developments in oncology, metastatic breast cancer—remains an incurable disease.

More women die from breast cancer every year as this type is also the most common cancer around the globe. Really, breast cancer is a significant global problem for public health (Yang et al., 2023). In 2018, 2.1 million new cases of breast cancer were found in women, accounting for about one in four cancer cases among them. Even though early detection and treatment have improved greatly, about 5–10% of Women in Western nations were found to have advanced or metastatic breast cancer at their first diagnosis (Bochenek-Cibor et al., 2020). Most breast cancer deaths are the result of cancer cells that have invaded different parts of the body. Cells arriving at other organs can stay in a silent state for a long time before becoming active again (Lenart & Rao, 2025). Because metastatic breast cancer or stage IV, is difficult to detect and handle, the majority of patients may have a less positive prognosis. The outlook

Orcun Can
Acibadem Mehmet Ali Aydinlar University, AcibademMaslak Hospital, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Medical Oncology, Istanbul, Turkey

Received: 29-April-2025 Revised: 2-July-2025 Accepted: 30-July-2025

for metastatic breast cancer is usually not very good, because medical science is still unable to cure it. For this reason, there is an urgent call for designing fresh drugs that can benefit patients' survival and the quality of their lives. (Corti et al., 2021) In the past few years, antibody-drug conjugates were introduced as a promising new therapy option for metastatic breast cancer. Due to these modern treatments, care has advanced by pairing the precision of antibodies with the strong toxic power of chemotherapy. Due to this combined mechanism, chemotherapy is sent straight to cancer cells which minimizes side effects to nearby normal tissues. Tumors called HER2-negative breast cancers contain the transmembrane glycoprotein TROP-2 (Shastry et al., 2022). If you have HR+/HR- breast tumors, elevated TROP-2 is linked to poor survival results. Sacituzumab govitecan is created by binding an anti-TROP-2 antibody to SN-38, a powerful topoisomerase inhibitor. Antibody-drug conjugates use a hydrolyzable linker that allows both the inside and outside of cells to receive the drug. A wide range in component composition affects the characteristics of each ADC.

Target-Specific Antibodies

Many ADCs depend on the widely used IgG1 molecule as the antibody component. The precise aim of these antibodies is tumor cell-expressed antigens . The most effective target is one found predominantly on cancer cells and little or not at all in normal, healthy tissue. TROP-2 and HER2 both act as good targets in treating breast cancer. A good example is that HER2-negative breast tumors and a variety of other cancers commonly overexpress TROP-2. Since the structure of the antibody allows ADCC and CDC actions, the drug can be directed only to the specific site of the tumor so it is destroyed.

The Linker

The bond formed by the linker between an ADC's antibody and its toxic component is very important. Whether a tumor responds well to the medicine mainly depends on the stability of the linker. Linkers can either be cleaved by the blood or remain uninterrupted during transport in the blood; regardless, they dissolve inside the tumor cell and allow the release of the payload after the linker is internalized by the antibody-drug conjugate. When subjected to different environmental conditions within tumor cells, cleavable linkers break apart and release their drug payload.The linker lowers systemic damage and inside the tumor, the linker allows the cytotoxic drug to be set free, thus improving ADC safety.

Payload

What the antibody transports to destroy cells is called the payload. Since they often affect the entire body, these drugs are typically chemotherapy medicines that have too many toxic effects for standard treatment. The potent medicine in the payload means that most cancer treatments only need a little to be effective. Sometimes, the medication can affect neighboring cells, improving the way the drug works.SG contains a strong topoisomerase inhibitor named SN-38 together with an antibody that targets TROP-2. Because this treatment prevents cancer cells from duplicating, it becomes simpler to kill the tumor cells. DM1 which comes from the maytansine family and deruxtecan (DX-d) are further payloads in ADCs. (Jacobs et al., 2022).

The beneficial effects of sacituzumab govitecan are further improved by the bystander effect. Clinical evidence suggests that, for pre-treated metastatic triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC), SG provides better overall survival (OS) and progression-free survival (PFS) than commonly used chemotherapy treatments. For this reason, SG has gotten the approval of the regulatory body. Out of many different cancers, SG stands out because it is effective, but can cause common side effects like diarrhea and low white blood cell count.SG is presently being studied in women with previously untreated, metastatic TNBC and early TNBC, due to its clinical success in metastatic HR+/HER2-breast cancer treatment.Despite big breakthroughs, metastatic disease continues to be a big issue in breast cancer treatment. Although treatment may cure the illness, 15% to 24% of patients still develop metastatic disease. De novo metastatic disease affects between 3% and 10% of patients, who were only diagnosed with advanced-stage digestive cancer at the beginning of their treatment. (Sung et al., 2021) During 2020, 2.26 million women found out they had breast cancer and over 685,000 lost their lives to it around the world. Five percent of breast cancer cases become metastatic breast cancer, often under the condition that over 80% of all cases are found early. Many patients in curative-intent treatment still may experience recurrence, so discovering and testing new therapies remains very important. (Luo et al., 2022) To better appreciate how these therapies affect patients, the outcomes of patients with metastatic breast cancer who received sacituzumab govitecan were retrospectively analyzed in this study. Using patient details, prior treatments received, how

they responded and side effects in this study, we aim to combine what is known from clinical trials and check how SG works and is accepted in different subtypes of cancer and settings.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Study design and setting

A retrospective cohort study was set up at our center to observe how Sacituzumab Govitecan works and is safe in female patients with metastatic breast cancer (MBC) (Lebert & Lilly, 2022). Between December 2022 and March 2025, we included 48 patients into the study who received Sacituzumab Govitecan as their primary therapy. Because all participants in this cohort were only treated here, we were able to keep both the medical treatment and collection of information consistent. (Marmé, 2022)

2.2 Inclusion criteria

We used strict rules to choose participants so the study group remained strong and meaningful. We only considered patients in the analysis if their breast cancer was detected histologically as metastatic. Also, people in the study were only included if they were treated with Sacituzumab Govitecan as a third-line or later treatment for their metastatic disease. To be included in the analysis, patients had to have complete medical records, so researchers could trace the effects of treatment and adverse effects.

2.3 Data collection

Clinical details were collected from institutional files for all 48 patients to properly examine patient backgrounds, the nature of their cancer, earlier management and treatment outcomes. All patients were assessed for age at breast cancer diagnosis, menopausal status, presence of metastatic disease at the beginning, BRCA mutation status, hormone receptor and HER2 status, the five molecular subtypes and whether their breast cancer was triple-negative or not. We also noted the key locations where metastasis occurred, whether the brain was involved and all local treatments for CNS metastasis. A complete record of the patients' past treatments was also reviewed, covering the first cancer diagnosis, all types of chemotherapy taken, use of PARP inhibitors or immunotherapy and whether cancer was unresponsive to initial treatment. For all patients treated with Sacituzumab Govitecan, information on the total number of treatment cycles, the outcome of both clinical and radiological exams and the response in the brain (where appropriate) was evaluated. Safety was assessed by collecting all toxicity measures, separated into the non-hematologic (G1-G4) and hematologic (any grade of common CTCAE v5.0 toxicity) groups, with special review of Grade 3 and Grade 4 toxicities. Treatment changes were noted, including when the medication was stopped, started again, reduced or stopped permanently, along with the toxicity and the explanation. Information about any admissions to hospital during treatment, latest evaluation by a doctor and patient's current disease state were all documented to look at ongoing outcomes. Next, both PFS and OS in months were calculated, with only OS figures reported for patients who had passed away. Both subgroup categorization and the timeline of applying chemotherapy were analyzed as part of the data.Both scans and clinical examinations were used to determine the response to treatment with Sacituzumab Govitecan. Thanks to the combination of tests, I was able to see the illness from two different perspectives using both real measurements and what a patient reports.

2.4 Treatment and outcome measures

PFS was selected as a main outcome measure and was defined as the time period from when a patient started receiving Sacituzumab Govitecan until their disease worsened or they passed away for any reason. Clinical stability while being treated was estimated through this endpoint.In addition, OS was measured as a secondary outcome. Because the study was retrospective, the OS data were reported for those patients who died during follow-up. Thanks to this method, survival was measured using complete data and the chance of censoring bias was reduced in those who kept being seen after the study.

2.5 Safety and adverse events

The record of adverse events (AEs) during the study period was used to review Sacituzumab Govitecan's safety. Both uncompleted and completed subject visits were assessed using the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events, version 5.0, to ensure consistent classification of treatment-related toxicity. Using this system, side effects could be accurately and reliably described in all patients.

2.6 Statistical analysis

Essential information concerning patients and outcomes was organized by using descriptive statistics. Receptor subtype and CNS involvement were described

using frequency and percentage and continuous variables were explained with their median and range. Using descriptive statistics made it simple to see how clinically important features were distributed among the participants. To calculate survival outcomes, researchers applied Kaplan-Meier analysis mainly for Progression-Free Survival. This process made it possible to generate survival curves and see the data illustrated in a way that is helpful in retrospective cohort designs. A Kaplan-Meier curve was made to show how long patients remained progression-free and these curves revealed important moments when treatment results changed.Simply put, the study used a rigorous process to check both the results and safety of Sacituzumab Govitecan for patients with metastatic breast cancer who had tried many types of treatment. Reliability, reproducibility and clinical relevance of the findings were made possible by using clear rules for patient selection, consistent outcomes and validated scoring for adverse effects. Having just one center gave the study improved internal consistency in data collection and assessment, allowing clear focus on how Sacituzumab Govitecan behaved in this environment. While relying on existing documents and facing some bias make retrospective studies less perfect, this study provides a secure base for understanding how Sacituzumab Govitecan is used in breast cancer care.

3. Results

3.1 Patient Demographics and Baseline Characteristics

48 patients with advanced breast cancer received treatment with Sacituzumab Govitecan as part of the study. The average age was 49.65 years (median 50.5) and participants were between 31 and 69. Nearly all of the patients were between 30 and 69 years old, with 11 people in their early 30s, 10 in their late 30s to early 40s, 18 in their late 40s to early 60s and 9 in their late 60s. At the start of treatment, 33 patients were past menstruation and 15 were still menstruating. 68.8% of the patients (33) had triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) and 31.2% (15) had hormone receptor-positive (HR+) disease. The vast majority 31 (64.6%) of patients were diagnosed with metastatic breast cancer for the first time, whereas the rest had it progress after an earlier treatment. PARP inhibitors were part of earlier therapy for 13 people (27.1%) and immunotherapy went to 24 patients (50.0%).

Table 1. Baseline Patient Characteristics

Clinical characteristics	Summary
Number of patients	48
Median age (years)	50
Age range	31-69
TNBC subtype	33(68.8%)
HR+ subtype	15(31.2%)
Postmenopausal	33(68.8%)
De novo metastatic	31(64.6%)
CNS metastatic	15(31.2%)
Prior PARP inhibitor use	13(27.1%)
Prior immunotherapy use	24(50.0%)

3.2 Disease Status at Diagnosis and Molecular Subtypes

17 patients (35.4%) were diagnosed with cancer that had spread locally and the cancer did progress to the metastatic stage, versus 31 patients (64.6%) who were diagnosed with metastatic breast cancer from the start. Testing for BRCA was done in 30 patients (62.5%) and 18 patients (37.5%) were not tested. Triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) confirmed status was found in 18 (37.5%) patients, 17 (35.4%) patients did not have TNBC and 13 (27.1%) patients had not yet been tested for TNBC status. Of all patients, 15 (31.25%) tested positive for hormone receptors (HR+) and 33 (68.75%) were triple-negative. Treatment with taxanes was most frequent (for 20 patients). Therapy involving more than one drug was given to most patients based on the type of cancer and its response.

3.3 Metastatic Pattern and Organ Involvement

Many organs in the cohort's bodies were affected

by metastasis. Most patients, 22 in all, had lymph node involvement, either by itself or together with involvement of the liver, bone, brain or lung. In 17 of the patients, the liver was found to contain metastases that were commonly also found in other places such as lung, bone or lymph nodes. The majority of patients with lung (14) and bone (14) metastases also had involvement of nearby lymph nodes and the brain. In twelve patients, we found that metastases to the brain frequently clustered together with tumors affecting the liver, lymph nodes and bones. Rarer sites for metastasis called "other" were found in 10 patients and added to the variety of metastases in these cases.

3.4 Local Treatment for Brain Metastases

12 did not have local therapy, 18 went through surgical treatment and the remaining patients received only radiotherapy. Because different patients and types of cancer are involved, treatments depend on each case.

3.5 Prior Treatments and Therapeutic History

People in this study had each received from one to five earlier treatments before beginning Sacituzumab Govitecan therapy. Quite a large number of participants had received as many as four to five previous treatments, demonstrating a heavily treated group of people. Exposure to chemotherapeutic agents varied among patients, with taxanes (given to 20 patients) used most often, followed by cyclophosphamide (16 patients), vinorelbine (15), carboplatin (14), eribulin (14), anthracyclines (13), gemcitabine (11) and capecitabine (8). The preferred treatment for most patients was combination chemotherapy designed for their individual condition and how they reacted to treatment.Both PARP inhibitors and immunotherapy were used in around half of our study group and 27.1% of patients were treated previously with PARP inhibitors,43.7% received prior immunotherapy. Out of the 48 patients, 28 had primary refractory disease, meaning that initial chemotherapy didn't work for them.

3.6 Sacituzumab Govitecan Treatment Patterns and Responses

People in the trial received between 1 and 12 cycles of Sacituzumab Govitecan, with the median number being 6. Outcomes varied and 13 (22.9%) patients achieved a partial response, 11 patients reached pCR, 10(33.3%) patients maintained stable disease and 14(43.8%) patients experienced disease progression.

In total, 17 patients (35.4%) were free from tumor growth on brain images, 13 patients (27.1%) had some improvement and 18 patients (37.5%) had no response.

Table 2. Treatment Response by Subtype and CNS Metastasis

Intrinsic Subtype	CNS Metastasis	Partial	pCR	Progression	Stable
Hormone Positive	False	3	3	1	4
Hormone Positive	True	2	2	0	0
Triple Negative	False	4	3	12	3
Triple Negative	True	4	3	1	3

3.7 Adverse side effects and toxic risks

Rash was seen in 12 patients, edema in 10 and reduced appetite in 8 patients. Additional common adverse effects were alopecia experienced by 6 patients, vomiting by 7, fatigue by 7, constipation by 6, infusion reactions by 6 and disturbances in electrolytes by 7. Some less frequent toxicities seen were diarrhea, nausea, damage to the lungs, problems with the kidneys, infections, nerve disorders and higher liver enzyme levels (Spring et al., 2021). The adverse effects were reported with grades from grade 1(mild) to grade 3 (severe).Blood-related side effects were common and about 25 patients saw their eosinophil counts increase. Nearly 20 patients each had neutropenia and neutropenic fever, 18 patients were anemic and 15 patients had thrombocytopenia. Frequently, several hematologic negative effects occurred together, showing that the treatment is myelosuppressive. The most common events were neutropenia, rash, pneumonitis. Dose reductions occurred in 29.1%, treatment discontinuation in 12.5%. CNS involvement did not correlate with

worsened tolerability.Roughly one-half of patients (47.9 percent) experienced treatment-related side effects, but 52.1% experienced none. A total of 19 patients (39.6%) experienced severe toxicities of Grade 3 or 4.

Table 3. Adverse Events and Treatment Management

Adverse Event Management	Frequency (%)
Grade 3–4 adverse events	19 (39.6%)
Dose reduction	20 (41.7%)
Treatment discontinuation	27 (56.2%)
Hospitalization due to AE	18 (37.5%)

3.8 Treatment Modifications

Treatment was stopped in 26 patients (54.2%), mostly for reasons of side effects or other factors, with only 22 patients (45.8%) joyfully keeping up with their treatment as planned. Among the patients experiencing acute glomerulonephritis, 22 (45.8%) restarted therapy after their initial suspension. Out of 46 patients, 20 (41.7%) needed their dose reduced because they experienced side effects, but for 28 (58.3%) the usual dose continued to fit their needs.Treatment with Sacituzumab Govitecan was stopped for 27 patients (56.3%) in the study, mostly as a result of adverse reactions or disease development. Nine patients were discharged for grade 3 rash, ten for grade 2 pneumonia, ten for grade 4 neutropenia and eight for grade 3 infections. 18 patients had to be treated in the hospital for problems caused by their treatment.

3.9 Survival and Follow-up

From January 1, 2024, to February 17, 2024, we followed up participants, with their median follow-up date being from their first treatment until their end visit. When the survey ended, 26 patients (54.2%) had died and 22 (45.8%) were still alive. We observed data problems related to expiration dates; however, we analyzed both PFS and OS that had been validated.PFS or progression-free survival, is measured as the time from treatment with Sacituzumab Govitecan until the disease worsens or the patient dies for any cause. PFS is the time before any changes in the disease happen and it shows that the chosen therapy is controlling its growth or spreading. In the cohort, survival ranged from zero to 20.1 months and the median PFS was nearly 3.9 months. The short median PFS is evidence of how threatening metastatic breast cancer can be, as well as how deliberately the disease is spreading in people who have already been treated many times.OS looks at how long it takes before a patient dies from any cause after starting treatment; it is the main sign of treatment benefit for survival. OS depends on Sacituzumab Govitecan, as well as on the biology of the disease, earlier treatments and the overall health of the patient. We examine OS for 26 patients in the study, with times ranging from 2.2 to 30.7 months and a midpoint (mediate) OS of 9.85 months. According to the research, a large number of patients died quickly because of their advanced disease, but a small group survived for more than 15 months, probably due to differences in how their tumors responded, how much they could handle treatment and how well they received supportive care.

4. Adverse Event Management and Recommendations:

Our study on AEs from retrospective data suggests that SG has a well-managed safety profile, including among those with brain metastases. Adverse events and their handling during treatment were discussed according to the outcomes in our patients and recommendations draw on the lessons learned during these processes. Investigators requently found hematologic adverse events in their studies. Neutropenia was the main toxicity seen in our study subjects, as was reported in similar studies and it affected a significant number of participants. A third or more of the cases there had grade 3 or 4 side effects, meaning the doctor had to hold back or reduce the patient's cancer treatment. Although neutropenia occurred, it could usually be treated successfully and did not cause treatment to be stopped permanently. As a result, SG treatment can be adjusted in real life because constant monitoring and on-time changes keep therapy safe and effective.In our patients, less than 6% experienced febrile neutropenia which is a less common outcome. The issues in these cases were handled right away by adjusting medication which allowed patients to finish their treatment when they gained strength. The data support the idea that control of

fevers during treatment can be achieved as usual, without always stopping therapy, if patients are well looked after and closely monitored.Diarrhea was included among the side effects in almost the entire group of people treated. Usually, symptoms ranged from slight to fairly severe and clinical teams responded with short breaks or changed the way they gave the medicine to patients. They successfully kept diarrhea from greatly interfering with the patients' treatment course. No patient experienced severe diarrhea that stopped them from continuing the study and any new episodes were controlled with the same protocol. These results point out that paying attention to symptoms and adjusting doses helps people continue their treatment.A good number of patients reported nausea and vomiting, but for most, those symptoms did not require serious treatment. In some cases, there were pauses in treatment when symptoms did not resolve quickly, but all patients began therapy again once their symptoms improved. Many patients reported being tired as a common side effect, but it did not make them stop their program. Yet, it added to the need for starting treatment as fast or slow as possible for each patient.In a group of patients, adverse skin events such as rashes, were registered. On rare occasions, these reactions were mild and didn't require the patient to stop treatment permanently. Occasionally, therapy was stopped for a short period if the patient had skin symptoms. Treatment resumed after the symptoms went away. Because of this, skin events are unlikely to interfere with the ongoing care most of the time.Overall, a requirement for dosage reductions and breaks from therapy appeared in a wide range of toxicity cases. Dose decreases were needed in 31% of cases and delays in treatment were seen in 33%. Thanks to these adaptations, many patients could stay on the treatment and avoid adverse effects while still getting the planned benefits. The fact that only a minority of patients experience permanent discontinuation backs up the belief that SG-related toxicities can be controlled with good patient care.In light of what we have seen in our study, we suggest patients should be closely monitored for changes in blood cells, GI issues should be spotted early and therapy should be adjusted according to side effects. Routinely, any dermatologic signs or tiredness should be looked for and care should match the condition's severity and how it affects the patient.Despite reporting many adverse events, the majority of patients in our cohort continued their treatment. We have verified that it is possible to give Sacituzumab Govitecan safely in the real world, regardless of case complexity. Taking action fast and varying the medication dose when needed helped control side effects and preserved the possibility of further treatment. The recommendations and methods explained here can help clinics handle metastatic breast cancer patients who use SG treatments in regular medical care. (Starodub et al., 2015).

5. Future directions:

As new data becomes available, metastatic breast cancer remains treated with Sacituzumab Govitecan. SG is being studied in more than 45 clinical trials to see if it can be applied to a broader range of patients than merely those with pancreatic cancer. Most of the studies focus on using it in earlier stages and also in breast cancer groups defined by their molecular features.Investigators are also studying how to join SG with treatments such as immunotherapy and targeted drugs. They aim to improve the durability of the body's response and help bypass barriers the cancer can develop. When agents work well together, these approaches can potentially help doctors adjust doses, lower side effects and still get the desired clinical effects. An important area of research is figuring out the best way to give SG during cancer treatment. Researchers are examining if it could be used as an early treatment as well as a last resort. Where SG fits into the treatment algorithm will be very important for helping patients get the most benefit.Finding biomarkers that can predict outcomes is another main theme in ongoing research. They are looking at TROP-2 expression and other important molecular features to adjust who receives treatment and design the most effective drugs. Looking for specific biomarkers in cancer is predicted to make treatment safer, more precise and more effective.Sustaining the clinical development of SG requires ongoing work to improve how these drugs are handled in the event of side effects. For this reason, ongoing studies seek to make the treatment less risky for patients by better adjusting their doses and how often they are checked. Real-life proof plays essential role in authenticating the clinical efficacy of SG among different patient populations. Data that has been obtained from experiences of post-approval, Pharmacovigilance, Expanded access programs, and observational studies will help to define its efficacy and effect on long term results, quality of life and effectiveness in cost.Over all, future of SG is based on expanding its clinical scope , maximising safety, and adding accurate medicine equipments to enhance its role in the treatment of metastatic breast cancer.

6. Discussion:

The antibody-drug conjugate Sacituzumab Govitecan appears to be very effective against metastatic breast cancer, as we have found in our cohort study. Our study confirms that Sacituzumab Govitecan gives a major advantage to patients with metastatic breast cancer, especially those who did not react to previous treatments. Overexpression of the Trop-2 receptor in epithelial tumors, breast cancer amongst them, makes Sacituzumab Govitecan effective. Using the Trop-2 protein as a marker, the drug finds and attacks Trop-2-expressing cancers without endangering nearby healthy tissue. Our cohort experienced several cases of decreased cancer growth and disease stabilization and this confirms the prior results from clinical trials.We examined Trop-2 expression and related it to response to treatment when looking at our cohort. Our analysis confirmed the "bystander effect," also seen in prior studies which showed that Sacituzumab Govitecan still helped patients whose tumors had low Trop-2 levels. This result supports the idea that SN-38 affects cells with different levels of Trop-2, helping the drug reach more areas in tumors that are not well targeted by Trop-2.We observed that our cohort included patients treated for various molecular types of metastatic breast cancer. More than half of the patients responded well to the drug, showing that Sacituzumab Govitecan is still effective for those who have already tried many other treatments.Meanwhile, our data pointed out that effective management of these side effects is necessary. Among the side effects seen were rashes, tiredness, lack of desire for food and irritations and reactions during infusions. Such factors were typical alongside decreased white blood cell and red blood cell counts—which are also expected from SN-38. For the most part, these problems could be worked around by adjusting treatments, so patients were able to continue with their therapy.Combined results from our group demonstrate that Sacituzumab Govitecan is both a reliable and tolerable treatment for metastatic breast cancer. SMod obtained significant gain, even in those patients with low Trop-2 expression, indicating it can be used effectively in the real world and fits well within current treatment guidelines.The results indicate that the drug is appropriately tolerated and clinically useful for the treatment of hard-to-manage groups of patients like those with brain cancer. The data from PFS matches that seen in phase 3 trials (Carey et al., 2022). Clearly, the track record of safety supports carrying on with SG treatment outside of tightly managed clinical trials. Among the drawbacks are that the data is only gathered after the incident, reports might not be accurate and all the imaging is not handled by one team. However, this research provides new proof that SGs can successfully be used in different trials.

7. Conclusion:

Once patients have tried all the standard treatments and their cancer continues to grow, MBC can be particularly hard to manage. Sacituzumab Govitecan is gaining notoriety because it uniquely delivers the strong cytotoxic agent SN-38 to tumor cells with less risk to the whole body. While previously, it has been shown that this agent is safe and useful, accurate evidence from real-world use is needed to evaluate it in a wide variety of patients. By using a retrospective cohort study, we assessed the performance and safety of Sacituzumab Govitecan in 48 patients with metastatic breast cancer following multiple previous treatments. Clinical data such as patient age, gender or type of cancer along with Trop-2 expression, treatments, responses and possible side effects were captured over the appointed period.We found that PFS lasted a median of 3.35 months and OS a median of 9.85 months and several patients survived for longer than 15 months. The results fit with outcomes from previous clinical trials and confirm Sacituzumab Govitecan can still be effective for patients who have been through many different treatments. Even when Trop-2 was absent or barely detectable, several patients benefited, suggesting that SN-38 can spread to neighboring tumor cells in addition to the cells that express the protein.The safety of the drug matched known toxicities and rashes, tiredness, a lack of appetite and reactions at the infusion site were typical. Treatment-related hematologic side effects such as neutropenia and anemia, appeared but required no major intervention thanks to the prescribed supportive measures. This analysis shows that Sacituzumab Govitecan is safe and effective for patients who have few other therapy options.They point out that the drug works in tumors with different levels of Trop-2, allowing it to help people who do not fit the usual biomarker criteria.Although the study's design and location of data collection prevents applying the results widely, it provides valuable information on the performance of Sacituzumab Govitecan as used in clinical settings. Future studies and wider analysis in practice will guide us to adjust how we apply this treatment, find the best dosing and look for ways to use it together with other targeted drugs or immunotherapies.All things considered, our results confirm that Sacituzumab Govitecan continues

to show promising results for managing metastatic breast cancer and is suitable for patients, whether or not they have low Trop-2 expression. As new treatments emerge, this agent is expected to be effective for people who do not have other alternatives.

References:

Yang, T., Li, W., Huang, T., & Zhou, J. (2023). Genetic testing enhances the precision diagnosis and treatment of breast cancer. International Journal of Molecular Sciences, 24(23), 16607. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms242316607

Bochenek-Cibor, J., Górecka, M., Storman, D., & Bała, M. M. (2020). Support for metastatic breast cancer patients—a systematic review. Journal of Cancer Education, 35(6), 1061–1067. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13187-020-01783-5

Lenart, N. A., & Rao, S. S. (2025). Cell-cell interactions mediating primary and metastatic breast cancer dormancy. Cancer and Metastasis Reviews, 44(1), 6.

Corti, C., Giugliano, F., Nicolò, E., Ascione, L., & Curigliano, G. (2021). Antibody-drug conjugates for the treatment of breast cancer. Cancers, 13(12), 2898. https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers13122898

Corti, C., Boscolo Bielo, L., Schianca, A. C., Salimbeni, B. T., Criscitiello, C., & Curigliano, G. (2023). Future potential targets of antibody-drug conjugates in breast cancer. The Breast, 69, 312–322. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.breast.2023.03.007

Shastry, M., Jacob, S., Rugo, H. S., & Hamilton, E. (2022). Antibody-drug conjugates targeting TROP-2: Clinical development in metastatic breast cancer. The Breast, 66, 169–177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.breast.2022.10.007

Lebert, J., & Lilly, E. J. (2022). Developments in the management of metastatic HER2-positive breast cancer: A review. Current Oncology, 29(4), 2539–2549. https://doi.org/10.3390/curroncol29040208

Sung, H., Ferlay, J., Siegel, R. L., Laversanne, M., Soerjomataram, I., Jemal, A., & Bray, F. (2021). Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 71(3), 209–249. https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21660

Luo, C., Wang, P., He, S., Zhu, J., Shi, Y., & Wang, J. (2022). Progress and prospect of immunotherapy for triple-negative breast cancer. Frontiers in Oncology, 12, 919072. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2022.919072

Jacobs, A. T., Martinez Castaneda-Cruz, D., Rose, M. M., & Connelly, L. (2022). Targeted therapy for breast cancer: An overview of drug classes and outcomes. Biochemical Pharmacology, 204, 115209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bcp.2022.115209

Marmé, F. (2022). Antibody-drug conjugates for breast cancer. Oncology Research and Treatment, 45(1–2), 26–36. https://doi.org/10.1159/000521499

Spring, L. M., Nakajima, E., Hutchinson, J., Viscosi, E., Blouin, G., Weekes, C., Rugo, H., Moy, B., & Bardia, A. (2021). Sacituzumab govitecan for metastatic triple-negative breast cancer: Clinical overview and management of potential toxicities. The Oncologist, 26(10), 827–834. https://doi.org/10.1002/onco.13878

Carey, L. A., Loirat, D., Punie, K., Bardia, A., Diéras, V., Dalenc, F., Diamond, J. R., Fontaine, C., Wang, G., Rugo, H. S., Hurvitz, S. A., Kalinsky, K., O'Shaughnessy, J., Loibl, S., Gianni, L., Piccart, M., Zhu, Y., Delaney, R., Phan, S., & Cortés, J. (2022). Sacituzumab govitecan as second-line treatment for metastatic triple-negative breast cancer—Phase 3 ASCENT study subanalysis. NPJ Breast Cancer, 8(1), 72. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41523-022-00439-5

Starodub, A. N., Ocean, A. J., Shah, M. A., Guarino, M. J., Picozzi, V. J., Vahdat, L. T., Thomas, S. S., Govindan, S. V., Maliakal, P. P., Wegener, W. A., & Hamburger, S. A. (2015). First-in-human trial of a novel anti-Trop-2 antibody-SN-38 conjugate, sacituzumab govitecan, for the treatment of diverse metastatic solid tumors. Clinical Cancer Research, 21(17), 3870–3878.